

RECEIVED  
BES: AVAILABLE COPY  
SEP 19 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|                                      |   |                          |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| First Named Applicant:               | ) | Art Unit: 2188           |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| Serial No.: 10/764,946               | ) | Examiner: Doan           |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| Filed: January 26, 2004              | ) | HSJ920030237US1          |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR SELECTING | ) | September 19, 2006       |
| COMMAND FOR EXECUTION IN HDD BASED   | ) | 750 B STREET, Suite 3120 |
| ON BENEFIT                           | ) | San Diego, CA 92101      |
|                                      | ) |                          |

REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Dear Sir:

This Reply responds to the Examiner's Answer dated September 14, 2006. The Answer correctly notes that Clegg et al. discusses the advantages of writing sequential data records into a disk cylinder before moving to another cylinder and addressing read requests by linearly increasing block number, but continues to stumble into the *non-sequitur* that this means that Clegg et al. must not only calculate but also "use" a pipe length to calculate a throughput benefit. The sequential data records that Clegg et al. teaches can be short, or long, or somewhere in between for all Clegg et al. cares. The point of Clegg et al. is that the records are sequential totally independent of their combined length. "Proximity" (Clegg et al.) does not equal "length" (Claim 1).

The examiner and now the conferees continue to refer to the present specification, which is not part of the prior art and which in any case does nothing for the examiner's case. That Appellant has taught that a "pipe" might be a string of sequential commands does not transform "proximity" into "length", much less

1159-17.RPL

CASE NO.: HSJ920030237US1

Serial No.: 10/764,946

September 19, 2006


Page 2

PATENT

Filed: January 26, 2004

does it confer upon Clegg et al. a realization (never made by Clegg et al.) to calculate a benefit based on pipe length as recited in Claim 1. Without those transformations the rejections merit reversal.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John L. Rogitz  
Registration No. 33,549  
Attorney of Record  
750 B Street, Suite 3120  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1109-17.RPL